

Finally, the time has come for the television industry to heed the advice of Macaulay to "Reform if you would conserve." You cannot get protection without providing a service worth protecting. You cannot beat something with nothing.

Your claim to protection against competition from community antenna systems and from pay TV rests largely upon the fact that you provide local service. If that claim is to be persuasive, your service to local needs and interests must be real and substantial. It cannot be limited to one or two regularly scheduled news programs and a very occasional local "special." Riding the network and relying upon the projection of old movies may be as easy a life as riding the rails, but in the long run it may be just as dangerous.

Moreover, the search for maximum profits in the short run does not represent maximum wisdom in the long run. With every dollar that drops into your till from the sale of advertising, you are creating a greater public willingness to pay for programs without commercials. There is such a thing as pushing the long-suffering public too far, and those who do so may find the eggs that are laid far from golden.

But above all, wired television systems challenge you to bring more variety and more choice into the present system. In addition to emphasizing program diversity in order to give the public more choice on present outlets, the Commission has sought in every way to encourage the development of additional outlets on UHF channels. Your long-range interests and the interests of free television generally are dependent upon the success of UHF television.

If free enterprise cannot come to television via UHF channels, it will do so by means of wires and microwave relays. The result may not be all that you—or I—would hope. But in the long run the choice is inexorable.

For modern technology and the modern marketplace afford us no easy resting place. In today's communications industry we are propelled around the bend and into the future not to the steady chug-chug of a Mississippi riverboat, but to the piercing whine of an Atlas Agena rocket. How we will navigate depends both on the natural forces within the industry and our response to them. Can we create conditions under which the constructive forces of the marketplace will flourish and the destructive forces be controlled? That, I suggest, is the challenge that confronts us today.

Foreign Aid—Operation Niños

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, many of the social problems in Latin America are staggering. For instance, it is the rule, rather than the exception, that the majority of the population of Latin America live in substandard dwellings that are overcrowded and without sanitary facilities. Often whole families live in one room, sharing it with their chickens, piglets, and working tools. If the family is fortunate, they have a meager plot of ground to cultivate which would be considered untillable by American standards. Their shanties are bordered within a few feet by the same type of dwelling, often consisting of a simple thatched

roof and walls of pressed tin cans, palm leaves or cardboard. Picture a hillside of these "houses"—either in a remote village or a plush resort city—and it is a typical Latin American scene often described as "local color" by the American tourist.

Picture also a flock of half naked children who consider one of these dwellings their home by night, for they only can sleep there. Regardless of the weather, their daylight hours are spent on a hillside playground of rock and dirt. When evening comes the children take over the shelter, sleeping on pallets of flat, woven straw while the adults gossip over kerosene lamps on the ground outside, the smell of charcoal and cooking oils filling the dank night air. This is the life of the Latin peasant and their niños.

If youngsters are raised in squalor, with inadequate food and without education, they cannot develop strong bodies and clear minds necessary for a full life. Instead they will face a hostile world of frustration and disappointment. As the leaders and workers of tomorrow, children should, and do, receive special attention in our aid program.

Two American assistance programs, involving both private and public co-operation, offer hope for a better life to the children of Chile. One is an Alliance for Progress housing program—a self-help program where the new owner does most of the construction work, the Alliance furnishes the tools and equipment, and the Chilean Government offers technical assistance to the new owner-builder. The other is Operation Niños, a food-for-peace program, in which our surplus food helps to feed 10 million hungry Latin American children.

Well illustrating the effective assistance these two programs are giving to underprivileged Latin American children, is the story of 6-year-old Alicia Vilche, a dark-eyed, black-haired Chilean moppet who was living in a shanty town one room shack with dirt floor, void of windows, heat, electricity or water.

Two years ago, Alicia moved with her family into a 4,000-unit housing development called San Gregorio on the outskirts of Santiago, which was sponsored by the Chilean Government and the Alliance for Progress. In line with the self-help emphasis of the program, Alicia's father, a construction worker, built his own three-room home with tools, equipment, and building materials furnished by AID through an Alliance for Progress loan of \$713,000 to the Chilean Government. Payments on the \$680 house are geared to the \$18 per month salary of Senior Vilche.

Last year Alicia began school in near-by San Salvador community center which is operated by the Church World Service, a private American voluntary relief organization. Here Alicia first came in contact with Operation Niños. Every morning Alicia and her 3- and 4-year-old sisters receive a hot breakfast at the community center which their mother, again in the vein of self-help, assists in preparing as a volunteer member of the community center's

mothers club. Because the Vilche's income is so small, each member of the family also receives a monthly supplement of 5 pounds of food-for-peace flour, corn, and powdered milk.

Good housing and food has left an amazing effect on Alicia. Much more attentive in class, she has a new spirit and enthusiasm. Gone are the haunting memories of poverty, sickness, and malnourishment which retarded her earlier development. Now, thanks to American loans and food distributions, Alicia and other children like her have hope for a bright future in which they can contribute their part toward building a modern nation.

It's Time for United Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I encountered an article entitled, "It's Time for United Statesmanship," which I am sure is worthy of publication in the RECORD and should have the wide circulation enjoyed by the RECORD.

The article follows:

IT'S TIME FOR UNITED STATESMANSHIP

(By a puzzled and worried American citizen)

There are some things happening around the world that scare the living daylights out of me and I hope you share this concern.

I read in the papers recently that the Soviet Union is setting up a satellite observation station in Cuba.

This followed on the heels of a report from Cuban exiles, whose underground frequently has been more accurate than our CIA, that at a base 30 miles west of Havana and 5 miles from the northern coast of Cuba, three missiles 70 feet tall are aimed at the United States, manned by Soviet troops; and that nine other missiles are stored underground at the base.

These reports, in turn, followed Castro's impudent action in turning off the fresh water supply at Guantanamo and our weak-kneed and fainthearted "retaliation" which is costing American taxpayers untold millions to haul water from Fort Lauderdale and to distill it from the sea. Here, obviously, we missed a real chance to show some signs of strength.

These events, in turn, followed the murder by the Communists of three American flyers over East Germany.

You don't have to have access to the secret information of the State Department, the CIA or the White House, or to be an expert of foreign affairs to conclude that as of now this country has no positive program regarding Cuba and the elimination of communism in this hemisphere, and that it is suffering from what can be described only as a deterioration of the backbone and a softening of the muscles. I can't and don't believe that this is the will of the American people.

On July 24, 1963, our Embassy in Havana was confiscated. Representative YOUNGER, of California, dug into this and found that only once before in our history has this been done. That was when the Japanese moved into Vietnam and temporarily took over our Embassy in Saigon. The Germans, the Ital-

April 9

A1770

ians and the Japs did not bother our Embassies during World War II. Even the Chinese have not made a move toward our Embassy.

In the opinion of many Congressmen this action by Castro was tantamount to an attack on Miami or Washington. What did our administration do about it? As far as I know, it did nothing and said nothing except, "Tut. Tut. Well. Well."

Back to Cuba in a moment, but in the meantime let's look at how the United States is being regarded today around the world.

Henry J. Taylor, in an article copyrighted by United Features Syndicate and appearing in leading newspapers, had this to say:

"Are we falling for Soviet gradualism?" he asks. Here's part of what he says:

"A Castro-trained Zanzibar pigmy can put a gun at the back of our American consul and walk him to the docks. Do our ships move to protect him? Oh, no, he's just booted off to East Africa like a bag of burlap."

"Three American airmen can be shot down in East Germany, and so what?"

"Soviet stooges can bomb the U.S. Embassy on Cyprus, surrounded by the great U.S. 7th Fleet, and photograph our Ambassador struggling in the debris and dust. The front-page pictures were a sellout in Nicosia while the population watched the Americans flee."

"Two-penny Ghanaian tyrant Kwame Nkrumah makes Red hay with anti-American insults, and threatened, helpless U.S. teachers are given 24 hours to get out of the country."

"Congolese make a mockery of our official representation, burning our flags and tearing American passports into pieces."

"Panamanian whatnots, led by more than 70 Castro-trained goons, can ambush and kill our soldiers in the Balboa High School and bomb our Embassy to boot. Our dead are quietly returned to America."

"For the past 2 years, some place in the world, American embassies, consulates or agencies have been attacked, burned or looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity. And every time even a little bobtailed tyrant kicks us in the teeth, to say nothing of Khrushchev or Mao, Washington hastens to say he didn't mean it."

"Castro can cut off a U.S. naval base's water. We talk tough on Monday and decide on Tuesday that he doesn't mean too much trouble, after all. Meanwhile, Soviet troops can remain 90 miles off our shores 15 months after the President of the United States told the world that they must leave."

"In all this we are supposed to find a foreign policy? We are to believe a policy exists? This is not a policy; it is a catastrophe."

"The result? It is not easy for a country to chop the world's leading nation down to size. But the U.S.S.R. is doing a first-class job of it."

"What we are seeing is the Soviet technique of gradualism. Accustom people to retreating and you cannot only push them out of firm positions (like Cuba) but they'll even begin to believe that ducking into doorways is really much better than walking down the street."

"This means the aggressor is getting what he wants by having it given to him. Throughout all history that has always been the road finally to war (or surrender), never peace."

"Our momentum down this disastrous road must be broken. Never in history have enemies won so much by so little. Never have our incredible losses in strategic positions and world authority mounted so rapidly and on all sides."

"If we do not retaliate against the calculated humiliations we're suffering all over the globe, our days as the world's No. 1 power are numbered. The Soviet and its stooges cry 'Frog' and we jump. This must stop, or God help the United States."

There are several ugly questions hanging in the air that need answers, and these answers do not appear to be forthcoming from this administration. Here are a few of them:

1. THE INTELLIGENCE GAP

Many Members of Congress feel there is a potentially highly dangerous intelligence gap. That we have known since February 8, 1963—low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuba by Navy and Air Force pilots have been suspended on direct orders by the White House, despite protests by both services that these flights are necessary if we are to know what is really going on in Cuba; and that high-level U-2 reconnaissance flights, now under the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency, have been kept to a minimum, with none passing directly over Cuba.

True or false?

2. THOSE "FISHING BOATS"

I am told that Russia is using a fleet of high-speed so-called "fishing boats" to export Fidel Castro's Communist revolution to other Latin American countries. I understand that there are now around 200 of them:

That these oceangoing vessels which have the deceptive configuration of trawlers and which can sail rings around the World War II naval vessels of neighboring Caribbean nations, are transporting arms and guerrillas.

That those "fishing boats" have a carrying capacity of 150 to 250 passengers, or 300 to 550 gross tons of fish or arms, that their speed ranges up to 30 knots. As far as fish are concerned, the well-founded suspicion is that most of them have yet to wet a net and that they are built strictly for dirty work at the Latin American crossroads.

True or false?

3. THOSE CAVES AND TUNNELS

You hear a lot about the caves in Cuba. Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1963 stated that there are indeed countless thousands of caves in Cuba and that many of them are large enough for storing military weapons, including missiles. Furthermore, he stated that aerial reconnaissance indicated roads recently built to known cave locations.

On April 1, 1963, Representative CLEVELAND inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a piece from the Saturday Evening Post on this subject, pointing out the highly significant fact that it was possible for some caves fronting on the ocean to contain submarine pens, and there has been additional information since to indicate that this is so.

Is it any wonder that Castro doesn't want on-site inspections?

According to Free Cuba News, the newsletter of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, the Soviets have secreted guided missiles in the Russian-made tunnels in La-Gobernadora hills, near Cuba's principal naval base of Mariel. Electrical systems are also said to be installed at the nearby base of Meseta de Anafe and are connected with the guided missile stations at LaGobernadora.

True or false?

4. THE STENNIS REPORT

In May 1963 the Stennis senatorial investigation committee, including both Republicans and Democrats, issued a hard-hitting, unanimous report stressing the gravity of the situation. The committee gathered its information from top people in the administration.

The Stennis group was particularly concerned over repeated published reports from exiles and refugees that Soviet missiles are concealed in Cuban caves.

These reports are all the more alarming in view of the administration's admission that, lacking onsite inspection, no one can say for sure that all the Russian missiles have been removed.

Consequently, Republicans have called on the President to resume discussions leading to the onsite inspections demanded in October 1962, and waived a few days later.

What has happened to the recommendations in the Stennis report?

5. THE PORT OF BANES

With very little effort, Russian submarine bases can be established in Cuban ports. Already there are widely published reports that a Soviet naval base is under construction at the Port of Banes. This, of course, could neutralize the American base at Guantanamo. The administration is silent when the question of Banes is raised.

6. THE ISLE OF PINES

We know beyond any doubt that there is a tremendous Soviet buildup on the Isle of Pines.

We know that this is the transshipment point for arms drops to Latin America and that the Russians have asked that the Isle of Pines be turned over for use exclusively by the Russians for such arms buildup and as an available depot for arms drops to other Latin American countries.

7. TRAINING IN TERRORISM

Early in 1963 the Nation's intelligence chief, J. A. McCone, Director of the CIA, reported to a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House that 1,000 to 1,500 trainees from every Latin American country, save one, went to Cuba to receive training in guerrilla warfare, sabotage, and terrorism.

There are ample grounds for believing that Cuba is the campus for an even greater number of such trainees today.

Today reports of a shocking new policy by our State Department are gaining circulation.

The Hall Syndicate, Inc., reveals that behind the recently announced orders to withdraw military dependents from Guantanamo there is an inner, long-range State Department plan to "phase out" this country's occupancy of the big, strategic naval base.

This report says: "A major premise of the State Department's plan is that sooner or later Castro will take the Guantanamo issue to the United Nations, and the United States should be ready to give up the base rather than risk a censure vote."

I think that the American people are entitled to some straight nonpolitical answers now to the questions I have raised, and others.

How about it, Mr. President?

What about the intelligence gap?

What about those fishing boats?

What about those caves and tunnels?

What about those 70-foot missiles west of Havana?

What about the Isle of Pines?

Is a Soviet naval base with submarine pens under construction at the Cuban port of Banes, or isn't it?

What is your attitude about the Monroe Doctrine?

What about the Stennis report?

How much is it costing American taxpayers to provide fresh water to Guantanamo?

If it is such a good idea to convert sea water at the base, why didn't we start preparing to do it years ago when trouble with Castro started instead of waiting until now?

How many Russian troops and technicians, or whatever you call them, still remain in Cuba, and what functions are they performing? Are they actually running things in Cuba or aren't they?

What are our long-range plans regarding Guantanamo? Is there any truth to the rumors of the "phasing out" policy of our State Department?

Certainly these are not things somebody dreamed up to embarrass you politically. There has been too much sober, well-in-

formed discussion of them in Congress to justify such a notion.

Yes, Mr. President, what about Cuba and what are we going to do about it? The American people are entitled to know.

Congressmen are getting a lot of mail these days from puzzled voters who can't understand why we are supporting a Communist coalition on Laos, yet we fight the Communists in Vietnam with more than 15,000 Americans stationed there, continue to lose a lot of American lives, and spend around \$1.5 million a day and do practically nothing about the Communist threat at our doorstep.

This Cuban situation obviously is a nasty thorn in the side of this administration—as it should be.

The do-nothing, wait-and-see policy, if you can call this a policy, seems to be rooted in the philosophy that any positive action would risk a nuclear war; that anyone who brings up the subject is a warmonger, playing politics, or is some kind of a nut or something. Administration spokesmen then promptly attempt to sweep it under the rug.

This is obviously a matter of grave national concern and should not be a partisan issue, but it is becoming abundantly clear that today we can look only to Republican leadership to restore what ex-President Eisenhower has aptly called "United Statesmanship," to erase the tragic and threatening mess in Cuba, which is obviously our first essential step in building new respect for ourselves, not only throughout Latin America, but throughout the world.

Obviously the only thing that is going to get action is a truly aroused electorate.

It seems pretty clear by now that, in spite of all it costs them, the Russians have a good thing going for themselves in Cuba as part of their historic, long-range strategy of world domination and what Henry J. Taylor calls gradualism. It is an advanced intelligence base which can be used for electronic surveillance of our military and space activities in the southeast United States and the entire Caribbean area, and which is an ideal submarine base.

Even Harry Truman is critical of our foreign policy.

In an article copyrighted by the North American Newspaper Alliance appearing Sunday, March 1, he said:

"It is all too obvious that the position of the United States in the affairs of the world is not what it should be.

"Our leadership has been steadily losing its effectiveness. Our hopes for a world committed to peace, freedom and security for all seem to have faded in the resumed struggle for power and trade.

"It serves no useful purpose to protest or to ignore this unpleasant state. But we had better face up to it."

This isn't quite what you hear from the White House which claims we are loved throughout the world.

How much of this soft soap, I wonder, are the American people willing to take?

What can be done about it with minimum risk of war?

Let's not be trapped by the familiar administration argument and psychosis that to do something constructive we have to invade Cuba and risk a nuclear war.

Representative FOREMAN, of Texas, says: "I think the American people are correct in saying that they are tired of this business of being concerned with how popular we are instead of how right we are."

Obviously, if we are right, our popularity will take care of itself.

What are some of the right things we can do in a positive program?

Here are some of the most elemental things that best informed Members of Congress have demanded:

1. Step up our surveillance at least to the point where it was prior to the blockade of October 1962.

2. Abide by Public Law 87-872 and put

some teeth into trade restrictions which will prevent the free world from feeding the Cuban economy and relieving Russia in the process. Many practical measures have been proposed toward that end.

3. Restate and enforce the Monroe Doctrine which is based on the principle that a foreign government shall not colonize in the Western Hemisphere.

4. Recognize a Cuban Government in exile and take the initiative in helping to form one.

5. Revise the present punitive policy against Cuban patriots in exile, who through their independent activities, can at least buoy up the hopes of their helpless freedom-loving friends and relatives in Cuba.

6. In collaboration with the Organization of American States (a) forbid all travel between Cuba and the Latin American States and (b) stop all trade between Cuba and the Latin American States.

We should have learned by now that this Organization of American States welcomes the leadership of this country.

Have we forgotten how quickly they rallied behind us when we initiated and followed through on the naval blockade of 1962?

The Latins respect strength. Most of the Latin countries are genuinely with us. They are simply waiting for us to act—and we don't.

The time for action obviously is now. Every month, every week, the situation worsens.

More Cubans are constantly being indoctrinated in Moscow to hate us.

Every week more subversives are trained and planted in South America.

Every day more military equipment is accumulated in Cuba and more men are trained to use it.

The patriotic rebels in Cuba, who a year or two ago were raising havoc with the sugar harvest, are constantly growing less effective in their power to resist under the increasing surveillance of an increasingly powerful police state.

The Cuban economy grows stronger—rather than weaker, as we are often led to believe. And we are permitting this to happen.

Many Congressmen are of the view that with a policy of firmness on our part, the necessary results can be accomplished without a shot being fired, but that if it involves limited war it is a risk we must take, that the sooner we take it the better, and that this represents the will and true spirit of the American people.

It seems obvious that until this Red cancer is removed, and as long as we remain soft with this condition staring us in the face, our foreign policy in all other parts of the world, from Saigon to Havana and at all stops in between, is properly suspect and, in fact, a living lie.

The time has clearly come to stop drifting and dreaming, speechifying, pacifying, and alibiting about Cuba and about communism in this hemisphere.

It is equally obvious that we cannot look to this administration to do anything about it.

That's why I believe we must look to ex-President Eisenhower's "United Statesmanship" which is rapidly becoming the philosophy of the Republican Party.

That's why more and more people, as they watch the behavior of this administration in its incredibly soft attitude on Cuba, in its expedient and wobbly, jerry-built policy throughout the world and in its obviously political domestic policy of something-for-everybody-at-less-cost are deciding that it's time to be a Republican-American for a change.

They feel it is time to shore up America, that it is time to stand up in the eyes of the world, and that it's time for guts—not guts. Yellow simply doesn't go with red, white, and blue, and the American people are not yellow. These puzzled and worried

Americans, I am sure, want to close the ever-widening leadership gap and to vote America back on the track. That's mainly why they are going to vote Republican.

They feel that this is the best thing they can do for their country, which right now needs a lot done for it. It is later than you think.

Air Force Electronic Systems Division Best Served at Hanscom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 9, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the decision of Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert to retain the vitally important Electronic Systems Division at Laurence G. Hanscom Field in Massachusetts is one that the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress wholeheartedly approves and applauds.

While it has been known for the past few days that the decision on Hanscom would be a favorable one, Secretary Zuckert today in a lengthy memorandum made known the reasons which prompted him to reject the request for transfer of some or all of the Hanscom functions to Griffiss Air Force Base in New York. I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks correspondence dealing with Hanscom.

While I am sympathetic with the Rome, N.Y., area over its concern about the relocation of certain Griffiss functions, I am most disturbed over the efforts of some of my colleagues from New York to raid Hanscom and I see little justification for efforts of this kind at a time when all defense installations are under review for possible closing by the Department of Defense.

For those of us in Massachusetts who have been aware of the ESD contributions to the defense effort for some time past, largely generated by the huge scientific-research complex Boston is fortunate enough to have, the decision on Hanscom was the only one possible under the circumstances.

However, very many people became alarmed when what can only be described as a power grab began some weeks ago by some members of the New York delegation. Letters of protest descended upon Massachusetts Congressmen in growing numbers, but there was little in the way of positive assurances for these good people until the Air Force had completed its survey of the functions at Hanscom.

This Air Force decision was expedited in great measure, in my opinion, through recent actions of our Committee on Armed Services when the Subcommittee on Real Estate, of which I was chairman a few years ago, now ably directed by our distinguished colleague, the courteous and capable gentleman from Mississippi, my valued and esteemed friend [Mr. WINSTEAD], was called upon to give routine clearance to a land acquisition project affecting Hanscom.

A1772

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 9

The project called for the acquisition of some 40 acres of land near Hanscom for the 200-unit housing project, authorized and funded by the Congress last year. Early this year the Air Force released \$3½ million in funds so that the work, already long delayed, could get underway.

The Air Force presentation to justify the project had just begun when questions were raised about the necessity for such housing at a time when the Air Force was surveying Hanscom.

The House met at 11 a.m. that day and the subcommittee adjourned without taking any action on the Hanscom project.

In view of the need for early approval of the land acquisition project for Hanscom, Chairman Vinson of our committee wrote Secretary Zuckert on March 16, reciting the facts and urging an early decision on the over-all Hanscom survey so that some disposition of the subordinate land acquisition problem could be made.

That subcommittee decision was also made today, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to report that the subcommittee endorsed Secretary Zuckert's decision on Hanscom by a vote of five to two in favor of the acquisition of needed land for Hanscom housing.

If it had not been for Chairman Vinson and our committee, I feel sure it is quite possible that Hanscom would still be the subject of conjecture and uncertainty.

Let me make it clear that Chairman Vinson took no sides on this issue. He simply let it be known that it would be desirable to have an early Hanscom decision, one way or the other.

The members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress from the outset vigorously protested the New York raid on the Hanscom functions. While it is difficult to see how the Air Force could have come to any other conclusion on Hanscom, especially in view of the huge investment the Federal Government already has made in the Hanscom facilities, totaling over \$70 million and the obvious invaluable character of the unmatched scientific and research and development advantages of this base, the delegation worked most energetically as a unit to retain Hanscom at full strength.

There is a lesson for all of us in the Hanscom situation, Mr. Speaker. There is every indication that more and more of the outmoded or surplus defense activities will be curtailed or phased out partially or completely in the months and years ahead. When that time comes, congressional efforts should not be geared to raids on other parts of the country with requests for time-consuming and expensive surveys, as has been done here. Rather, it would seem to me that action be directed toward the retention of the facilities in question and the best possible case made with the officials concerned and our colleagues here in the Congress.

In that way, sectional differences would be eliminated and a more sympathetic and greater awareness of the problems of other areas might well result when these matters come up for discussion in the House. Moreover, interested

groups should exercise good judgment in not jumping the gun on rumors and speculative reports and conclusions.

Pertinent correspondence on Hanscom follows

MARCH 24, 1964.

Hon. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.:

Have been greatly concerned about your survey possibly designed to remove Electronics System Division from Hanscom to Griffiss. Believe such a move would be extremely ill advised, costly, wasteful, inefficient, and harmful to national defense. Strongly urge your rejection incredible proposal New York Senators and early activation before our Real Estate Committee your own prior proposal commencement housing project at Hanscom. Will be most grateful your consideration and favorable action in this matter. Thanks and regards.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is to acknowledge your telegram of March 24 concerning a proposal to transfer the Electronic Systems Division from Hanscom Field to Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y.

This proposal was placed before the Air Force on an official basis by several members of the New York State congressional delegation. They also approached the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA) with a view to determining whether NASA could use any facilities vacated by ESD.

We are conducting a study of this proposal and have established contact with NASA officials. This study is necessarily complex because of the wide range of ESD activities. We expect that a final answer will be available next month. At that time we will promptly inform you.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. LOCKHART,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Deputy, Director, Legislative Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 9, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is in response to your recent letter, signed jointly with other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, in which you recommended the retention of the Electronic Systems Division (ESD) at Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass. Several members of the New York State congressional delegation had suggested that ESD be moved to Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. Their suggestion was predicated on the projected availability of resources at Griffiss resulting from the phase out of the Rome Air Materiel Area (ROAMA) and the need of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for facilities and capabilities to establish their proposed Electronic Research Center in the Boston area.

We have made a detailed, objective analysis of this proposal, considering the impact on manpower, facilities, and dollars. The results are described in the attached outline.

Our conclusion, after these evaluations, is that the retention of ESD at Hanscom would best serve the Government's interest.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

CONCLUSIONS RESULTING FROM ANALYSIS OF PROPOSAL TO RELOCATE THE ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION (ESD) FROM LAURENCE G. HANSCOM FIELD, MASS., TO GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Several members of the New York State congressional delegation have proposed that

the Electronic Systems Division (ESD), now located at Laurence G. Hanscom Field (near Boston, Mass.), be moved to Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. It was postulated that ESD could use resources at Griffiss made available by the phaseout of ROAMA. This, in turn, would make available to NASA the facilities and capabilities of ESD for the proposed NASA electronics center in the Boston area.

The first step in our analysis was to consider the resources and missions of the major Air Force activities involved in the proposal.

(a) At Griffiss Air Force Base, the following situation prevails:

1. The Rome Air Materiel Area (ROAMA) is being phased out. This will make available nine warehouse-type buildings, of which about 315,000 square feet have been modified for administrative purpose. The more modern of these facilities are under consideration for use by other Air Force activities scheduled to remain at Griffiss.

2. The Rome Air Development Center (RADC) executes the systems command exploratory and advanced development programs in electromagnetics. It also provides technical support to ESD in the design, engineering, and development of subsystem components and equipment. Some 40 percent of RADC work is done for ESD. Less than 10 percent of the total ESD work is accomplished by RADC.

(b) Located on or near Hanscom Field, Mass., are the Lincoln Laboratory, the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratory (AFCLR), the Systems Development Corporation (SDC), the Electronics Systems Division, and the MITRE Corporation. The effect of the proposed move of ESD on these activities is as follows:

1. Lincoln Laboratory and AFCLR accomplish basic research functions. While their colocation with ESD is not essential, the nearby availability of their considerable human talents does substantially assist in the accomplishment of the ESD mission.

2. SDC is a service activity of ESD. Again, although colocation with ESD is not absolutely essential, it is desirable.

3. ESD is primarily responsible for managing the acquisition of electronic information and communications systems from initial concept to their installation as a part of the Air Force inventory. There is a continuing shortage of Air Force personnel sufficiently trained to perform the in-house engineering and technical support required in the acquisition of modern Air Force weapons and support equipment. As a result, "not-for-profit" corporations have been established to provide systems engineering and integration for Air Force programs. In the case of electronic systems, MITRE performs this vital function. Thus, it is an essential part of the overall ESD operation and any separation of these two activities would bring about unacceptable increases in costs, and slippages in urgent national command and control programs.

4. MITRE is presently located 4 miles from Hanscom in facilities which cost over \$9 million. The mortgage on their buildings (owed by MITRE) has a present unpaid balance of some \$5.1 million.

(c) The following information concerning the proposed NASA Electronic Research Center was developed:

1. NASA has budgeted approximately \$56 million for the Center (exclusive of land costs). They have estimated that approximately 40 percent of this is for building construction, with the remaining 60 percent to be spent for equipment acquisition and installation. This is subject to refinement after the final site selection.

2. On the basis of moving ESD, and its integral component MITRE, to Griffiss, the Civil Engineer, Hanscom Field, after study-